

# THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

*"The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth."*

VOL. 2.

New York, Saturday, December 4, 1847.

NO. 15.

S. R. KIRBY, M. D. AND R. A. SNOW, M. D., EDITORS.

This JOURNAL will be issued on the first and third Saturdays of each month at One Dollar a year, in advance. City subscribers will be regularly served at their residences by sending their names to the Editors.

Subscribers may remit to the Editors, by mail, the amount of their subscription—the Postmaster will frank all letters containing money for this Journal.

Country subscribers can have the Journal sent to them by mail, on the above terms.

All communications must be addressed, (post paid) to the Editors, 311 or 729 Broadway.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, DEC. 4, 1847.

## THE DRUGGING SYSTEM.

The wholesale manufacture of drug compounds, and the common employment of them by individuals, and in families, demands the attention of those whose duty, profession, or interest it is to study, and promote the welfare of the public, and to protect it from injury and imposition. The confidence which was once reposed in the prescriptions of the regular physician seems to have been transferred to the regular quack. "Do discerning men leave the thorough-bred and skillful watchmaker, and take their time-pieces to the blacksmith, the ship carpenter, or the farmer for repair? Why, then, do so many turn aside from the learned and experienced physician, and entrust those living chronometers of theirs, a thousand times more complicated and important than their best patent-levers, or gold repeaters, to the remedial care of men who know little more

of their structure or laws of action, than infants know of algebra?

In addition to the multitude of ignorant quacks that are fattening upon the public credulity, or its incredulity of the medical art, millions of dollars are annually expended in the United States alone, for base compounds, mixed up by vile pretenders to the art of healing, and greedily swallowed by all classes of persons—the learned and the wise as well as the ignorant and foolish.

—Very few families can be found that have not more or less of these pernicious drugs in their houses. Does not this simple fact argue, most conclusively, a very serious, if not radical defect in the healing art? That the employment of these crude compounds of poisonous drugs by those who suffer from real or fancied ailments, is productive of extensive mischief, and is the cause of innumerable broken constitutions, and premature deaths, is believed and taught by all intelligent persons, in and out of the profession, who have given the subject attention. As we have had occasion before to remark, this matter has attracted the notice of some of our daily prints, which are beginning to expose the evils of the whole drugging system. The immense sums which the nostrum vender expends in advertising, will not long, we trust, interpose an obstacle to a full exposition of the evils growing out of this business, by the more popular journals of the day. When the magnitude of the evils arising from it, and the facilities for spreading and increasing them, which are afforded by means of advertising, are considered, it is to be hoped that editors, and conductors of newspapers, will look fully and critically into the matter, that they may be enabled to disabuse the public mind, and adopt such other measures in relation to it, as a sense of right and duty may dictate. We are satisfied that proper inves-

tigation of the subject will develop the fact, that the present system of drugging is one of the great evils with which society is tormented.

Whatever may be thought by some, of the expediency of instructing the public on medical subjects, nothing is clearer than that they should be taught enough to enable them to comprehend the baneful influence of crude drugs upon health and life, and to induce them to abandon practices so utterly at variance with their best interests. And since medical journals do not meet the public eye, it is right and proper that the antidote should be diffused through those channels in which the poison has so freely flown.

We give the following as a specimen of the numerous *editorial notices* of the manufacture of these abominable agents of disease and death, induced, it is not uncharitable to conclude, by the money which is received for advertising them :

"Persons wishing to buy any of the popular patent medicines can find them genuine at the Depot of Messrs——. This is probably the most extensive establishment of the kind in the City, and every article in the line of patent medicines can be found there. Few we suppose have an idea of the immense quantity of such medicines consumed in the City, and we believed there are no dealers more in repute, than Messrs. —."

This is copied from a paper, the editor of which is believed to have no confidence in the virtues of crude drugs, no matter how they may be prepared or by whom prescribed, if he does not condemn medicine altogether as an art; at all events whose intelligence and convictions on the properties and effects of drugs must cause him to abominate the business of mixing and selling them.

Such notices must escape his attention altogether, or be allowed a place without thought, as they are inconsistent with the high regard for the public welfare, generally manifested in his paper, on other subjects. He would not thus commend to public attention a dram shop, and yet, in view of facts, and in the light of truth, dram drinking differs from drug swallowing, not in the ultimate result, but in the time it takes to reach that result.

It is curious to notice, that that branch of the medical profession in which the compounding and selling of drugs originated, has been compelled, by a sense of duty to itself, to combine to arrest it. They have taught the people that drugs were useful in

puking, purging, and sweating, and the people, having ascertained that drugs will puke, purge and sweat, whether prescribed by the doctor or not, and partly because his prescriptions have failed to cure, and partly to avoid his bills, they have become accustomed, to prescribe for themselves, or have sought the puking and purging compounds of the speculating quack, who, having stolen the recipes of the physician, is serving the devil in his own livery. The combined influence of the allopathic school, sought to be arrayed against the preparation and sale of drugs, by non-professional individuals, and against the employment by the community, grows out of the necessity of self-protection; and their arguments against what they would style, their empirical use of drugs, will not serve to enable them again to monopolize the business, as people generally are as well acquainted with the primary effects of medicines, as the doctors themselves, and they cannot be made to believe that if they are really hurtful in their influence of health and life, that, being prescribed by the regular physician, will disarm them of any deleterious quality, or add to them a single virtue. The sooner, therefore, they understand this, the better—the consequence will be the entire abandonment, as well by the profession as the people, of the use of crude drugs, either for the cure or prevention of disease.

[For the American Journal of Homœopathy.]

### BARTLETT'S PHILOSOPHY OF MEDICAL SCIENCE.

BY HENRY C. KNIGHT, ESQR.

REMARKS.—The style of this book is quite beautiful, and whether you agree with the author or not, it may be read with unabated interest. There is an air of fairness about it, and I am quite willing to admit that Dr. Bartlett is an enthusiastic scholar, and a gentleman. His first principles are, in the main, absolutely true; but he soon relapses into many errors which he condemns; and it is as utterly impossible for him to support his ultimate doctrines, by the justly admired Baconian system of philosophical inquiry, as it would be for Dr. Samuel Thompson in like manner to establish his.

VIEWS OF HOMŒOPATHY.—Our author states—and here he uses nothing more dignified or rational than the *argumentum ad invidiam*—that the Homœopaths attribute a numerous list of chronic and a majority of acute diseases, to the *itch*.

He undertakes to enumerate the principles of Homœopathy as follows:—

1. To the entire human organism is super-added an immaterial principle—a dynamic or moving force—active in itself—by which the organism is moved and controlled.

2. Every modification of this immaterial and independent principle, &c. manifests itself by external signs or symptoms, &c. These changes themselves are beyond the reach of our investigations, so that the study of anatomical lesions is only a vain dream.

3. The vital force being a dynamic power, the morbid causes and modifiers do this only by virtue of a dynamic power in themselves, &c.

4. The effects of these modifiers, &c. can only be ascertained when the dynamic vital force is not operated upon by morbid dynamic causes.

5. The totality of the symptoms and the disease being, so far as our knowledge is concerned the same thing, when the former are removed the latter is cured.

6. [This can only be accomplished, 1: by exciting actions like those of the disease, or 2: unlike those of the disease.

7. All pure experience, shows that the latter is impossible; wherefore the former is the true mode.

8. The artificial action must be a little stronger than that representing disease.

9. Pure experience shows that all true remedies do act in this manner.

10. Remedies or modifiers, in order to produce the desired effect on the disturbed vital force must be introduced in exceedingly minute quantities.

Such our author believes "to be the fundamental principles of the Homœopathic doctrine;" and he triumphantly asks, if these consist of "phenomena and relationships?" and undertakes by assertion to show that they do not. Vain and unphilosophical effort! How can an asserted fact, one testified to by an observer, be disproved, but by making the very observations which the affirmant has made? When Dr. Bartlett has done this in relation to any part of the homœopathic system, he may be allowed to testify, but not a word before. Until he does so, his assertions can have no more force than those of the veriest barbarian.

On page 195, he says that our system is no new thing; it is very much like the *archeus* of Von Helmont and other old systematists."

Verily this is philosophical accuracy! Supposing our doctrine to be overthrown, it cannot overthrow any other, unless they are identical in their foundation, or necessarily dependent upon one another. Besides this assertion is false even to the extent of stupid folly.

On page, 247, he says "Homœopathy coolly refers nearly all diseases to the *"itch."* Terrible heresy, if they do, which is not the fact. If they did it would be no argument to state the astounding fact, with the last vulgar word in italics.

I will now offer a few remarks on the above statement of homœopathic first principles. And I would respectfully request the reader to take the trouble to compare each item, by the numbers, so that he may form some estimate of the flimsy arguments employed against us, as well as the reckless manner in which they write about that, of which they are ignorant. This is taught and believed in by homœopaths, generally, though it is stated a little differently; but it is not a fundamental principle, but a theory of Hahnemann, deduced as an inference from his actual discoveries, years after they were made.

No part of homœopathy depends upon it. It may be false and yet every part of the system will remain. It may be true that pure experience proves it to be true, though I think it does not absolutely, but only renders it highly probable. Hahnemann nowhere lays it down as a fundamental principle. A fundamental principle is that which, from being invariably observed to be true, is known to be a law of nature; and which being true forms a logical foundation for necessary inferences. A mere isolated fact does not deserve this title, because upon it nothing is founded. This is Hahnemann's invariable mode of proceeding, and no medical writer, adheres with one-half of the absolute fidelity, that he does, to the rigid principle of *Novum Organum* of Bacon.

2. The fact that diseases are only known by their symptoms, and that when these are removed, so far as our knowledge extends, the former are cured is so entirely and absolutely a fact, that nothing short of downright bigotry would ever deny it. We know nothing of disease, excepting its sensible effects or manifestations, in some form or other. No sensible, honest, Allopathic physician, pretends that we know more. This is what the Homœopath means by "symptoms and totality of symptoms." The difference between him and the Allopath, is that he gives medi-

cine according to a known rule, and which corresponds with the symptoms in each individual case, or to every disease, for disease is an individuality, formed and modified by each particular constitution, to a greater or less extent. Dr. Bartlett, evidently, does not understand the meaning of the word symptoms, or he never would have asserted that our doctrine renders the study of anatomical lesions a vain dream. They are an essential part of the symptoms of disease. The terms *independant* and *external* are the doctors own. Yet as he states the thing, it is more nearly true than might at first thought appear. How does the Allopath pretend to know that organic lesions exist in the living organism, but by external signs? If his medicine so acts that these signs disappear, does he not conclude that the disease has terminated? Likewise does the Homœopath, except that he knows a vast deal more about the radical cure of chronic forms of disease than Allopathy ever dreamed of.

It is true that the two schools place a different balance upon the study of pathological anatomy. We have a law—*similia similibus curantur*—which evidently renders a post-mortem dissection of very small value in the administration of medicine. Again it is too inaccurate to show the exact identity, between two cases of disease; Homœopathy is far more accurate. And again it is wholly unknown and scarcely dreamed of by the learned demonstrators of the old school, how large a portion of their anatomical lesions, are absolutely produced by the medicines that the unfortunate subject has taken.

This is not a principle of the system, although believed generally, upon the testimony of facts, i. e. that the modifiers act, not chemically, but dynamically, to wit: upon the imponderable body or bodies, which govern or produce all the phenomena of vitality. Where is the *a priori* absurdity of this?

4. This is a certain truth, but in one sense it is not a fundamental principle of the Homœopathic doctrine." It is however the first truth, in this sense, that being first *discovered* to be true by observation, it is the important and radical law of the Homœopathic administration of remedies. Setting out with the first truth of reason, that observation and experience alone could furnish any true knowledge in physical science, Hahnemann complied with the conditions of knowledge and *discovered* that the effects of modifiers upon

the healthy organism do furnish a *certain rule* for their use in connecting a morbid derangement. If this be a fact then the above proposition is necessarily true. It never was advanced as an *a priori* principle, as an axiom or first truth of reason, but as an *posteriori* conclusion. Let Dr. Bartlett make the necessary observations, and then he will "know of the truth" and in no other way.

5. I have already remarked of this above. It is not a first principle, but an inference, or a result of observation.

6. The man that denies this must be blind indeed. Here is its equivalent—remedial agents in their operation on the human system, either have a tendency to produce morbid symptoms similar to those existing in the disease for which they are given, or else dissimilar. This proposition includes all possible cases and must necessarily be true. Now whether the Homœopathic, Allopathic or Antipathic mode be the true mode must be ascertained by pure experience. This is the foundation of our system and we claim, nay, we know, that experience, not in individual cases merely, and not in hundreds, but absolutely in *millions*, proves it to be true.

7. Included in the last remarks.

8. Not "a fundamental principle of the Homœopathic doctrine," but a conjecture of Hahnemann.

9. A question for pure experience to settle. Dr. Bartlett's assertion cannot overthrow it. Allopathic experience does not reach it. Homœopathic experience, if true, if not indeed, grossly *designedly false*, settles the proposition affirmatively.

10. *A priori*, no man could either affirm or deny this proposition. It is the result of experiment, a conclusion, or perhaps I might say, a pure observation. As was said of the law, like curing like, it is not asserted as an axiom or first truth of reason, although it is a radical truth in medical science; not from theory at all, but from observation alone.

Suppose, for the sake of argument, that the law—*similia similibus curantur*—should be considered as a settled truth, then the doctrine of small doses follows inevitably and of necessity—not as a logical inference from it, but as the dictate of experience of every man. Every physician's experience and good sense would at once show him the madness of giving a large dose of Belladonna for inflammation of the brain, and yet Homœopaths give it in small doses and with an actual



success incredible to Allopaths, and therefore attributed by them to sheer fabrication. This result could only happen if the doctrine be true. It has happened as ten thousand competent witnesses can prove, and does continually happen, and as any man can prove for himself who knows enough of disease to give the medicine in strict accordance with the law, and therefore the doctrine is necessarily true.

THE "FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF HOMŒOPATHY," ARE :—

1. All science is truth, and our knowledge of it depends upon positive observation, and the first truths of reason and consciousness. It includes not only the simple facts of observation, but also all logical and necessary conclusions drawn from such facts, and nothing else.

2. Hahnemann, acting upon the evident suggestion of reason undertook *experimentally* to ascertain the relation, whatever it might be, between medicine and disease, by carefully trying it upon the healthy organism. This was to ascertain its true specific effects, and whether they bore any definite relation to disease. He therefore tried quinine, or bark, and found it to produce a type of intermittent fever. He tried this and other "specifics" repeatedly, upon various organisms, and found the results substantially invariable. His observations were facts. Here was a relation established between *certain* diseases and their known specifics.

But in the law of like curing like, an invariable rule, this is only to be ascertained by continued and varied experiments. These were faithfully made and the great discovery was complete. Thus in the strictest compliance with the philosophy of Bacon, the whole medical science, in its *practice* was reduced to a system of specifics.

3. In addition to the great law of cure, I class the doctrine of small doses among the "fundamental doctrines of Homœopathy." I need add nothing upon the subject in this place, except to remark that Hahnemann arrived at it entirely by experiments.

EVIDENCE.—Bartlett, however, denies that there is any evidence of "pure experience" to support the Homœopathic doctrine. He quotes only the Organon, and seems to be totally ignorant of any other book on the subject. Now the Organon simply contains an expose of results and inferences, not the observations themselves or the testimony of the witnesses.

It does not establish itself, but is dependent upon the observations and the testimony. These are to be found in full detail in various writings of Hahnemann, particularly in his "Materia Medica Pura," and "Chronic Diseases"; also in the "Archives" of Stapf, the writings of Hering, Jahr, and numerous others. Many of the provings have been repeated in this country by honest and scientific men, and all agree in the results. Now it is perfectly clear that the infinitesimal doctrines of Homœopathy are true, if the testimony of those persons and the thousands of physicians is true.

I have mentioned above what are truly the "fundamental principles" of Homœopathy. The other doctrines or the ones advanced by different writers may, or may not be correct, as inferences, without affecting the foundation of the same.

The great question recurs—is the testimony of the provers and practitioners, true! Dr. Bartlett says there is no evidence of observation to support one's doctrines. He must have been either utterly ignorant of the existence of such voluminous, and exceedingly—almost ludicrously minute testimony; or else he must have deemed it to be one stupendous conspiracy. This latter is too monstrous to suppose: or at least no man has a right to falsify such a host of witnesses, unless he employs some practical and faithful means of testing their veracity. They have detailed the whole process—there is no secrecy, no manner of concealment, and the Baltimore Professor is quite competent to put all their testimony to a rigid test. Let him do it—let him repeat the experiments in the way they have done, with an honest mind and then we should be glad to hear what he has to say.

With a word or two, I close. That Homœopathic success compares, at least, well with that of Allopathy, in the treatment of disease, can now admit of no doubt. It has been employed in an incalculable number of cases. It has been exclusively employed in all kinds of diseases. Now, one or the other of the two things must be true; either the medicines have no effect, and nature performs the cure; or they have a curative effect. If the former is true, then all medicines should be discarded—Allopathy a little before any other system. If the latter be true, then the Homœopathic remedies must have some peculiar relation to disease,

else it is impossible that such "infinitesimal doses" should have any curative effect. In the first case, Allopathy must be exploded as a sheer imposition upon suffering humanity; and in the latter its mystic compounds and heterogenous prescriptions, must give way to the simplicity and beautiful order of the system of Homœopathy. Our brethren who adhere blindly to the ancient modes, may take hold of whichever horn of the dilemma they feel most desirous to grapple.

Pontiac, Mich., Nov., 1847.

# REVIEW OF A REVIEW OF HAHNEMANN'S CHRONIC DISEASES.

By B. F. BOWERS, M. D., of New York.

Continued from Page 156.

The reviewer affects great candor and charity in his judgments. He says, "We do not wish to judge any man uncharitably, but we are directed by high authority to judge a tree by its fruits, and to this test we wish to bring the founder of homœopathy. We cannot reconcile, we repeat, with honesty of purpose, or even common humanity, this long and cruel silence regarding the success of his practice," &c. Long and cruel silence indeed! In the immediately preceding sentence you say, "for nearly thirty years, during all this long period he had been openly proclaiming the success of his system"—"he confessed that his system of practice had been an entire failure," and then you charge him with dishonesty and inhumanity for "this long and cruel silence regarding the success of his practice." It is difficult to reconcile such statements "with honesty of purpose," or even with common sense, for surely the "openly proclaiming during all the long period of nearly thirty years," backed by a public "confession," cannot properly be called a "long and cruel silence."

"It is dreadful to contemplate the" contradictions and absurdities which those persons fall into who sacrifice truth "to pride of opinion and obstinacy of will," and they would do well to remember that such conduct is "hardly atoned for by late and reluctant confession at a time when death seems staring them in the face."

Having shown that the reviewer has signal-ly failed to maintain his charges against Hahnemann, I will now introduce a few quotations from Hahnemann's letters to his friends, to illustrate his real character. In a letter to his bosom friend, the great and excellent Huf-

land, an allopathic physician of the highest standing, explaining his system, and the train of thought which led him to its discovery, he says, "There is a God—a good God, who is goodness and wisdom itself! There must, therefore, be some method of his own appointment of contemplating diseases under their true aspect, and of curing them with certainty; a method which shall not be hidden in endless abstractions and purely imaginary hypotheses. But why has this method not been discovered during the twenty or five and twenty centuries in which men have called themselves physicians? Because it is too near us, and too easy; because, to attain it, there is no need of brilliant sophisms or seducing hypotheses." "I would not exchange for all the most vaunted blessings in the world, the satisfaction which I have derived from this method." "How can he, in whose bosom beats a heart endowed with sensibility, or burns with the smallest spark of those noble sentiments which inspire in man the desire of being useful to his fellow creatures, hesitate for a moment to choose a method infinitely better than all others, and to trample under foot the dogmata of the schools, even though they boast of a thousand years duration?"

"Refute these truths if you can, by showing a still more efficacious, certain, and agreeable method than mine; refute them not by words, of which we have already too many.

"But if experience should prove to you, as it has done to me, that my method is the best, make use of it to save your fellow-creatures, and give the glory of it to God."

To his fellow-laborer, Stapf, he writes in regard to the proving of drugs, "Your observations are honest and exact. Continue to work in this true spirit. What we perform in this department is a religious work for the good of humanity. Men may or may not now recognize our pure and benevolent intentions; we do not live for the applause of men alone. The Omnipresent and All Holy One views our labor with complacency; and to Him alone, and to our own consciences, do we live here and hereafter."

It is impossible to read the works of Hahnemann with an unprejudiced mind and not come to the conclusion that he was an ardent and devout inquirer after truth. Nor is there wanting the testimony of allopathists to his superiority. Christison, one of the very highest names in his department of medicine, quotes Hahnemann as authority; and Dr. Forbes,

the learned editor of the "British and Foreign Medical Review, is compelled to admit that "Hahnemann was undoubtedly a man of genius and a scholar; a man of indefatigable industry, of undaunted energy." He says, "No careful observer of his actions, or candid reader of his writings, can hesitate for a moment to admit, that he was a very extraordinary man, —one whose name will descend to posterity as the exclusive excogitator and founder of an original system of medicine, as ingenious as many that preceded it, and destined, probably, to be the remote, if not the immediate cause of more important fundamental changes in the practice of the healing art, than have resulted from any promulgated since the days of Galen himself. In the history of medicine, his name will appear in the same list with those of the greatest systematists and theorists; unsurpassed by few in the originality and ingenuity of his views, superior to most in having substantiated and carried out his doctrines into actual and most extensive practice. Nor will the overthrow of his system, as a system, deprive him of his fame, so long as Paracelsus, and Stahl, and Silvius, and Boerhaave, and Browne are remembered by their successors in the schools of medicine." Again he says, "*It is but an act of simple justice to admit, that there exists no grounds for doubting that Hahnemann was as sincere in his belief of the truth of his doctrines as any of the medical systematists who preceded him, and that many, at least, among his followers, have been and are sincere, honest, and learned men.*" He speaks of causes which "have, up to this day, prevented common justice being done to the new system and to its author and his successors."

How strikingly the course of this leading medical journal contrasts with the paltry pettifoggery and malicious charges of the editor of the New York Journal. The reviewer's whole article proceeds upon the false assumption that "To arrive at a correct appreciation of homœopathy, we must study the character of its founder," and thereupon he proceeds to make a most unjustifiable attack upon the character of Hahnemann.

In attempting to repel the calumny, I have been influenced by a desire to vindicate the character of a great and good man, who, with indomitable energy, and uncommon purity of motive, has wrought a great work for his race; and I have desired also to show the spirit in which the reviewer undertakes the task of enlightening the public on the merits of homœo-

pathy. The character and writings of Hahnemann is a subject above the reviewer's sphere; to do justice to it requires a moral and intellectual elevation of which he has shown himself destitute. But really the character of Hahnemann has no necessary connection with the truth of homœopathy. Suppose Hahnemann was a bad man, suppose the very existence of such a man is disproved, still the law of nature, "Like cures like," has been revealed to us, and we know by manifold experience that it is the true law of cure. Does the mariner, in steering his course on the trackless ocean, stop to inquire into the character of the man who discovered it, before he will resort to the use of the compass? It is sufficient for him to know that experience has established its reliability and importance. Even though it were presented through unworthy agents, truth is good. It argues not only a bad moral state on the part of the reviewer, but also a conscious inability to sustain his objections by fair argument, thus to assail personal character. To vilify the character of Hahnemann is much easier for the reviewer, than to refute his arguments. And if he can succeed in exciting a strong prejudice against the author, it will be extended to, and prevent a candid examination of, his system.

For the same purpose, apparently, the reviewer attacks the professional character of every homœopathic practitioner. He says, "the want of success, which converts to homœopathy plead guilty of, during their allopathic practice, is not owing to any imperfection in the resources of the art, but to their own ignorance of the proper modes of employing them. Their medical education has been radically deficient, or their minds are incapable of profiting from clinical experience. We know men, who are very learned, so far as a knowledge of the literature of the profession is concerned, but at the bed-side they are entirely powerless; they know not how to apply their knowledge; they are always as likely to resort to wrong as to right treatment. It is not strange that such should take refuge in a system which claims to give them an infallible rule, a law which falsely claims to be of easy application, and to always lead to successful results. We do not believe that any man of a well constituted mind, whose faculties have been properly cultivated and trained, whose medical education has been conducted as it ought to be, and who has ordinary tact in applying his knowledge in the treatment of the



sick; we say, we do not believe that any such have ever, for a moment, been led astray by the vagaries of Hahnemann, or can be found enrolled among his disciples."

The converts to homœopathy do not plead guilty of any peculiar want of success during their allopathic practice; on the contrary, they claim to have been quite as successful as their neighbors in practicing allopathy. Whether there is any want of success to plead guilty of by the very best allopathic practitioners, and whether their want of success is owing to any imperfection in the resources of the art as taught and practised by allopathists, or to their own ignorance of the proper modes of applying them, themselves being judges, is easily ascertained by referring to their writings. Facts will show that homœopaths are more successful in curing disease than are allopathists. The inference naturally follows that homœopaths have minds better constituted, faculties more properly cultivated and trained, a medical education conducted more as it ought to be, and more than ordinary tact in applying their knowledge in the treatment of the sick, thus accounting for the greater success of the homœopathic practice by the superior character and attainments of those who practice it; or else, granting the superiority of the allopathic physicians, their want of success must be owing to the faults of the system upon which they practice; thus the superiority of homœopathic physicians over allopathic physicians, or the superiority of homœopathy over allopathy as a system of medical practice, one, or the other, or both, is established.

The opinion of Dr. Forbes may be cited in opposition to the reviewer, in favor of "homœopathic physicians, not a few of whom," he says, "are men of high respectability and learning, many of them in large practice, and patronized especially by persons of high rank." As the reviewer asserts that the want of success in allopathic practice by converts to homœopathy is owing to their ignorance of the proper modes of employing them, and not to any imperfection in the resources of the art, thereby implying that "the resources of the art," as understood and practised by allopathic physicians, who know "the proper modes of employing them," have not "any imperfection" and are consequently perfect; it becomes proper to inquire what is the state of the medical art among allopathists.

The reviewer himself says, "Notwithstand-

ing all that has been done, there is great uncertainty in diagnosis—in our knowledge of the character and progress of disease—and it is not to be expected that our *therapia*, or art of cure, will be perfected any faster than our knowledge of these advances." It is here admitted that there is great uncertainty in the art of cure; it is yet to be perfected, and the reviewer goes on to give reasons why, in his opinion, "*medicine can never attain to Hahnemann's standard, viz., that of a certain science!*" But there is a disingenuous attempt to give the erroneous impression that the "art of cure" has kept pace with the other branches of medical science. If homœopathy be excluded, such is not the fact. Dr. Forbes thinks it safe to say, "That the progress of Therapeutics" (or art of cure) "during all the centuries which have elapsed since the days of Hippocrates, has been less than that achieved in the elementary sciences of medicine, during the last fifty years. *This department of medicine must indeed be regarded as in its merest infancy.* It would, doubtless, be going far beyond the truth to assert, that there is no certainty in medicinal therapeutics, and that the whole practice of medicine, in as far as this consists in the administration of drugs, is a *system of traditionary routine and conventionalism, hap-hazard and guess-work*; but it is not going beyond the truth to assert that *much* of it is so." It must be confessed that homœopaths are ignorant of any modes of employing "*a system of traditionary routine and conventionalism, hap-hazard and guess-work,*" in such a manner as uniformly to secure very satisfactory results. "*Hap-hazard and guess-work*" hit very well sometimes, but are not as safe and reliable as "*certain science.*" Until it can be shown that "*guess-work*" is more successful in the treatment of disease, than careful calculation founded upon established principles, homœopaths will be obliged to derive their indications from a diligent observation of all the symptoms of disease, and carefully to search out and prescribe as remedies only such drugs as have a sure and ascertained relation to the symptoms.

The Medico-Chirurgical Review, also an authority of established character, in No. 108, for April, 1847, p. 398, says, "Had the indications of Nature, derived from a most diligent observation of all the symptoms of disease, been more faithfully followed out, and had the bold pretensions of pathological anatomy and physiology been more cautiously received, we



should not now have been exposed to the taunts of the empiric, nor to the still more humiliating conviction within our own minds, that the boasted discoveries of modern medical science have not taught us how to treat a large proportion of diseases a whit more ably or successfully than did many of our predecessors in the old time before us."

In his "Young Physic," Dr. Forbes adopts these inferences:

"1. That in a large proportion of the cases treated by allopathic physicians, the disease is cured by nature and not by them."

"2. That in a lesser, but still not in a small proportion, the disease is cured by nature in spite of them; in other words, their interference opposing, instead of assisting the cure."

"3. That, consequently, in a considerable proportion of diseases, it would fare as well, or better, with patients, in the actual condition of the medical art, as more generally practiced, if all remedies, at least all active remedies, especially drugs, were abandoned."

"Although homœopathy has brought more signally into the common day-light this lamentable condition of medicine, regarded as a practical art, it was one well known before to all philosophical and experienced physicians."

He believes the condition of physic at this moment to be this: "*Things have arrived at such a pitch, that they cannot be worse. They must mend or end.*"

Such are the results of the "known established methods of cure," the neglect of which by homœopaths so much hurts the reviewer's tender feelings. Let his grief be assuaged by the consideration that according to his own argument the results of homœopathic treatment all come under Dr. Forbes' inference No. 1, the disease being cured by nature, the physician not opposing the cure. It is only allopathic physicians whose "interference opposing, instead of assisting the cure, the disease is cured by nature in spite of them." And "it is dreadful to contemplate the number of lives which were thus sacrificed," where poor nature was compelled to give up the unequal contest and succumb to the disease and the doctor.

To be continued.

#### BRITISH HOMŒOPATHIC SOCIETY.

We have just received the proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the British Homœopathic Society held in London, on the 25th,

26th, and 27th of August. The following is a list of its officers and members, viz.:

Frederick Foster Quin, Esq., M. D., President. Joseph Giloli, Esq., M. D., Treasurer. Robert Ellis Dudgeon, Esq., M. D., Secretary.

S. T. Partridge, Esq., M. D.; Victor Massol, Esq., M. D.; J. Rutherford Russell, Esq., M. D.; J. Chapman, Esq., M. D.; James Goodshaw, Esq., M. D.; Henry R. Madden, Esq., M. D.; Francis Black, Esq., M. D.; Neville Wood, Esq., M. D.; Robert Walker, Esq., M. D.; James Loftus Marsden, Esq., F. W. Irvine, Esq., M. D.; Buchanan Ker, Esq., M. D.; John Norton, Esq., M. D.; Charles H. Mackintosh, Esq., M. D.; Edward C. Chapnell, Esq., M. D.; Hugh Cameron, Esq., M. D.; J. J. Drysdale, Esq., M. D.; George Newman, Esq., M. R. C. S.; Thomas Engall, Esq., M. R. C. S.; George Hilbers, Esq., M. D.; D. Wielobyckie, Esq., M. D.; Edward Hamilton, Esq., M. D.; John Ozanne, Esq., M. D.

With this Society, and acting in conjunction with it, is a lay organization entitled,—BRITISH HOMŒOPATHIC ASSOCIATION; of which His Grace the Duke of Beaufort, K. G., is President. Field Marshall, the Marquis of Anglesey, K. G., G. C. B., Vice President. Marmaduke B. Sampson, Esq., Chairman. Matthew Mashall, Esq., Bank of England, Treasurer. R. W. Heartley, Esq., Secretary.

COMMITTEE.—The Right Hon. Lord Aylmer; The Right Hon. Lord Gray; Joseph Bartoa, Esq.; Captain Branford, R. N.; Richard Bearmish, Esq., F. R. S.; Adolphe Boursot, Esq.; John Broadhurst, Esq.; Colonel Disbrowe; J. R. Elsey, Esq.; Charles Hamilton, Esq.; R. W. Heartley, Esq.; Thomas Hayle, Esq., M. D.; J. P. Knight, Esq., R. A.; C. D. J. Lowder, Esq., M. D.; Charles H. Mackintosh, Esq., M. D.; Geoffrey Nightingale, Esq.; John Ozanne, Esq., M. D.; John Simpson, Esq.; Charles Culling Smith, Esq.; Thomas Nevins, Esq., R. A.; Thomas Vincent, Esq.; William Walkins, Esq.

Dr. Black read a paper on Posology, or the doctrine of doses. This gave rise to a spirited debate, and all sorts of opinions were expressed, which amounted to just nothing at all. One thought "there was no necessity for going beyond the sixth dilution, as the particles of medicine at that dilution were sufficiently small to enter the smallest capillaries." An-

other believed, "that if the remedy were homœopathically selected, it would cure in whatever dilution it was administered."

The debate then reached the question of "aggravations," some contending, that "aggravations" were mistaken for "medicinal perturbation;" but this was left where every right minded person would have expected, just where it began. The "theory of dynamization" was also discussed. This theory received but little favor; but we should judge that the one advocated by Dr. Joslin of this city, and published in the first volume of this Journal, was regarded the most consistent. Yet no reference whatever was made to that paper, although it must have been in the possession of Drs. Quin and Drysdale. This debate shows to our mind, that on the other side of the Atlantic, no clearer views are had on the subject of doses, than we have on this side. We shall claim, however, that our views are the best, for so far as we have observed, Physicians of the Homœopathic School believe the facts, that attenuated medicines are the most suitable for the treatment of disease; and the particular attenuation must necessarily be left to the judgment of the Physician in individual cases. In this country, we do not dispute about the dose, for we believe it can never be settled;—although a contrary opinion is entertained in Europe from which comes most, if not all their difficulties.

The trouble we meet with in this country, consists in Physicians practicing Allopathy under the name of Homœopathy, and thus perpetrating an imposition. Yet we believe that in proportion as a knowledge of genuine homœopathic practice prevails, this evil will diminish; and we let the matter rest to avoid "perturbation."

We will quote Dr. Quin's remarks, which are a sort of summing up of the whole debate. He said—

"The most experienced was very much at sea on the subject of Posology. The difficulties of the question, though great, were not, however, to be considered insurmountable.—Nothing could be more true than the distinction which had been drawn betwixt aggravations and mere medicinal perturbations. A variety of symptoms started up, during the treatment of a case, which were not referrible to pure medicinal aggravation, but to sympathetic sufferings; patients were too apt to talk of aggravations, and medical men were frequently too prone to believe in their occurrence. The symptoms occurring after Sugar of Milk, alluded to by Dr. Partridge, were doubtless

owing to some extraneous substance mixed up with it during its trituration. The theory of dynamization had been to many a great stumbling-block; at first it assisted them greatly in getting over certain difficulties respecting the action of the infinitesimal doses; but, on maturer reflection, the utility of this theory fell somewhat in importance before the fact, that there is no limit to the divisibility of matter. His attention had early been called to the subject of dose, and the same difficulties which were now engaging the attention of the society had occurred to him. On asking Hahnemann how one could be guided as to the proper dose, Hahnemann replied, that if a perfect similarity existed betwixt the symptoms of the medicine and the disease, the dose could not be too small to act beneficially; but if the selection were carelessly made, and without proper attention to a perfect analogy between the effect of the medicine and the symptoms of the disease, that then the large doses prescribed often acted on the principle of *contra-ria contrariis*. Dr. Petroz, of Paris, had mentioned to him a fact corroborative of the correctness of Hahnemann's observation. In a case of epidemic dysentery occurring in an old person, Petroz had given, as was his custom, pretty large doses without effect. Hahnemann, on being called in, prescribed some remedy, in very minute doses, with almost immediate decided benefit. Dr. Leon Simon, of Paris, had related to him similar instances of Hahnemann's sagacity. He entirely differed with Dr. Gilioli, that the diseased organ was the best protected from the medicinal aggravation; on the contrary, he considered it to be the most susceptible to the action of the medicine. Dr. Gilioli's sympathetic aggravation seemed to him identical with what Dr. Black had denominated, in his excellent paper, medicinal perturbation. In addition to Nux and Arsenic, from which Dr. Norton had most frequently observed aggravations, he had seen them often follow the employment of Bryonia, Sulphur, Belladonna, and Calcareo carbonica. Up to the present time, no rule for their guidance in the selection of the dose or the dilution had been satisfactorily laid down. Early in his practice, he had under his care a woman affected with paralysis and loss of sensation in the lower half of the body. She had been bedridden for three years. After prescribing a variety of Medicines, he found that Bryonia and Rhus alone exerted any beneficial influence on the complaint; but their good effects soon went off, until he resorted to the plan of giving them successively in every dilution, from the 30th down to the 1st, and back again; and when he had descended and again ascended what he might call the gamut of both medicines several times, he found, to his great joy, that the amelioration of his patients' state became progressive, and she was finally cured under the action of these two remedies, followed by Sulphur. During the treatment, at various times, decided medicinal aggravations occurred; they did so, generally, whilst she was taking the higher dilutions."

For what reason we do not know, Dr. Curie

was personally denounced, and also the Homœopathic Institution in Hanover Square, with which he is connected. On the whole, we cannot say that the proceedings of the above meeting were characterized by either good feeling or good sense. There was too much of mere parade; too much "puffing" one another in the sessions of the society, and at the dinner. Although we thus speak, homœopathy is progressing in England.

### BELLEVUE HOSPITAL.

Our readers, doubtless know, that the Hospital of the Alms House of this city is designated by the above title; and also, that the medical department is under the management of an allopathic physician. The medical and surgical departments of the Hospital have always been under the control of a resident physician and some six junior physicians and students. By this arrangement things went on very well, at least, they were generally satisfactory to the sick of the Alms House and to our citizens. For years, no one thought of a rotation in office of the resident physician. Dr. Isaac Wood occupied the place with credit to himself for years, until his health compelled him to resign: since which, that office has been thrown into the political arena, and a new resident physician, has, we believe, been appointed whenever a change took place in the political complexion of our common council. The almost yearly changes in the medical department; the numerous applicants for that office; and the repeated disappointment of many, fixed the attention of a number of the profession who had little or nothing to do, upon that Hospital; and they set to work, to devise ways and means for the reorganization of the Bellevue Hospital, so as to make it, if possible, a stepping stone to the favor and confidence of the public. Several times, the attempt was made to effect the reorganization of that Hospital, but it failed, until a few weeks ago; when by abusing, and, as has been said, persecuting the then resident physician, privately and publicly; and by the aid of that political association, the "New York Academy of Medicine" a new order of things in form, but not in fact, has been secured. A large number of physicians and surgeons have been appointed by our common council, as consulting and attending

physicians and surgeons; but alas! these find themselves only assistants to the resident physician, similar to the students under the old organization, except, they are not entitled to good dinners at the Alms House table, as were the students. The whole glory of all their labor of body and mind, consists in having their names printed in the proceedings of the common council, as consulting physicians and surgeons; and attending physicians and surgeons, of the Bellevue Hospital. The former will probably never see the Hospital; and the latter can have nothing to do there, unless under the authority of the resident physician, Dr. D. Merideth Reese, as his assistants. This whole affair is one of the great "Humbugs of New York," which on a change of party in the common council will no doubt be annulled among its first acts. What agency, the cunning resident physician had, in so completely duping so many physicians and surgeons, we are not informed; but we believed, when they commenced their abuse of him, he would so manage, as to bring them to his feet, and subservient to his rule; which he has accomplished. Since the above was written, we notice, that a number of the attending physicians have resigned.

NEW YORK HOMŒOPATHIC DISPENSARY at 57 Bond Street. Open daily, Sundays excepted, at 3 o'clock, P. M.

Physicians in attendance, S. R. Kirby, M. D. Edward Bayard, M. D. S. B. Barlow, M. D. R. A. Snow, M. D. B. F. Bowlers, M. D., and John Hawks, M. D.

John A. McVickar, M. D., will attend to surgical cases every Saturday at 12 o'clock.

Dr. Kirby will lecture on Homœopathy on Saturday evening, Dec. 11th, at 7 1-2 o'clock, at No. 57 Bond Street. Students of Medicine and others interested in the subject, are invited to be present. Lectures will be delivered every Saturday evening, at the same place.

R. A. SNOW, Sec'y.

New York, Dec. 4th, 1847.

Three communications have been received from Dr. Kimball, which we have under advisement. One, from Dr. E. H. Clapp, Farmington, Illinois.



**NOTICE.**—The demand for the first volume of this Journal, induced the Publishers to reprint several numbers; and now, that volume can be had bound or otherwise. Orders may be sent to Charles G. Dean, No. 2 Ann Street; Wm. Radde, 322 Broadway; J. T. S. Smith, 488 Broadway, New York city; Otis Clapp, Boston; or C. L. Rademacher, 39 North Fourth Street, Philadelphia. Bound \$1 50. Unbound \$1 00. Stitched \$1 25.

We have received a communication from Dr. F. Humphrey's, justly complaining of the typographical errors and omissions in his able article in No. 13. We have already in No. 14 explained as far as we thought necessary at that time, and we relied upon the intelligence of our readers to correct such glaring blunders as "homœopathetically" for "homœopathically," "anti-poisons" for "anti-psorics," "bluntly" for "blindly," "process" for effects," &c., &c.

Subscribers in Philadelphia can pay their subscriptions to C. L. Rademacher, 39 North Fourth-st.

#### SMITH'S HOMŒOPATHIC PHARMACY.

No. 488 Broadway, corner of Broome street. J. T. S. Smith has a large assortment of Homœopathic Medicines, in tinctures, triturations, dilutions and globules; Arnica flowers; Sugar of Milk, Pure Alcohol, Distilled Water, Pellets, &c., &c. Physician's Pocket and Family Cases of Medicine on hand, and prepared to order. Homœopathic Plasters a substitute for ordinary Court and Adhesive Plaster, and an excellent application for Corns.

C. L. RADEMACHER, 39 North 4th street, between Arch and Cherry streets Philadelphia, Agent for the Leipsic Homœopathic Medicines, respectfully informs the Homœopathic Physicians and the friends of the Homœopathic system, that he has always on hand a good assortment of Homœopathic Medicines in their different preparations, viz: Tinctures, Triturations, Dilutions, and medicated Pellets.

Medicine Chests of different sizes for Physicians, with Tinctures and Triturations, Dilutions, or medicated Pellets. Also constantly on hand, Family Medicine Chests to suit, Hering's Domestic Physician; Laurie's Homœopathic Domestic Medicine; Epp's Domestic Homœopathy; Newman's Homœopathic Family Assistant; and the Family Guide. Also Refined Sugar of Milk, Alcohol, Vials of different sizes, Corks, Labels, &c

OTIS CLAPP, No. 12 School-st., Boston, has on hand, and for sale wholesale and retail, a large assortment of Homœopathic Medicines, in tinctures, triturations, dilutions and globules; Arnica flowers, sugar of milk, pure alcohol, distilled water, pellets, etc. Physician's pocket and family cases of medicines on hand and prepared to order, also a complete assortment of Homœopathic Books which are offered to the trade, and at retail as low as can be purchased elsewhere.

#### CLEVELAND HOMŒOPATHIC PHARMACY.

Up stairs, corner Superior st. and Public Square. B. H. BARTLETT respectfully informs Homœopathic Physicians, and others, that he has for sale, warranted, the principal HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICINES, in their different triturations and dilutions; Pure Spirits of Wine, for preparing and preserving medicines; Distilled water, prepared for immediate use; Refined Sugar of Milk; Pure Globules or Pellets, Vials, Corks, Diet Papers and Labels. Arnica Flowers and Arnica plaster.

Cases and single vials refilled, and Physician's and Family Medicine chests on hand, and put up to order. All orders by mail or otherwise for any of the above articles, or for any Homœopathic publications, promptly attended to.

J. F. DESILVER, 112 Main St. Cincinnati, Ohio, is the Agent for the West, of the Homœopathic Pharmacy at Leipsic. Physicians and others can always be supplied at this establishment with pure medicines adapted to the homœopathic system of treatment; medicine chests suited to Dr. Herring's Domestic Physician; refined sugar of milk, &c. Also Agent for the American Journal of Homœopathy edited by Drs. Kirby and Snow. New York; a semi-monthly publication at one dollar a year and adapted to lay readers.

GENERAL AGENCY of the Central Homœopathic Pharmacy at Leipsic for the United States, No. 322 Broadway. Wm. Radde respectfully informs Hom. Physicians and the friends of the System, that he is the sole Agent for the Leipsic Central Homœopathic Pharmacy, and that he has always on hand a good assortment of the best Homœopathic Tinctures and Medicines in their different Triturations and Dilutions: also Physician's Pocket and Family Medicine Cases, containing from 27 to 300 vials. Pure Spirits of Wine. Fine Vials, different sizes, and made of white glass. Corks. Diet Papers. Labels Homœopathic Chocolate. Arnica Plaster, an excellent application for Corns. Also an assortment of Hom. Books, in English, German, and French; as Jhar's Manual of Hom. Practice, in 2 vols., By A. Gerard Hull, M. D. Hahnemann's Chronic Diseases, in 5 vols., by Ch. J. Hempel, M. D. Hahnemann's Materia Medica, 2 vols., by Ch. J. Hempel &c